

Self-destructive percolation as a limit of forest-fire models on regular rooted trees

Robert Graf

Mathematisches Institut, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Theresienstr. 39, 80333 München, Germany

`robert.graf@math.lmu.de`

Abstract

Let T be a regular rooted tree. For every natural number n , let B_n be the finite subtree of vertices with graph distance at most n from the root. Consider the following forest-fire model on B_n : Each vertex can be “vacant” or “occupied”. At time 0 all vertices are vacant. Then the process is governed by two opposing mechanisms: Vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. Independently thereof and independently for all vertices, “lightning” hits vertices at rate $\lambda(n) > 0$. When a vertex is hit by lightning, its occupied cluster instantaneously becomes vacant.

Now suppose that $\lambda(n)$ decays exponentially in n but much more slowly than $1/|B_n|$. We show that then there exist a supercritical time τ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that the forest-fire model on B_n between time 0 and time $\tau + \epsilon$ tends to the following process on T as n goes to infinity: At time 0 all vertices are vacant. Between time 0 and time τ vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. At time τ all infinite occupied clusters become vacant. Between time τ and time $\tau + \epsilon$ vertices again become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. At time $\tau + \epsilon$ all occupied clusters are finite. This process is a dynamic version of self-destructive percolation.

Key words. forest-fire model, self-destructive percolation, regular rooted tree

MSC 2010. Primary 60K35, 82C22; Secondary 82B43

1 Introduction and statement of the main results

1.1 Introduction to forest-fire models

Forest-fire models were first introduced in the physics literature by B. Drossel and F. Schwabl (see [DS92]) as an example of self-organized criticality and have recently been studied by various mathematicians. Put simply, the notion of self-organized criticality is used for dynamical systems with local interactions which are inherently driven towards a perpetual critical state. At the critical state, the local interactions build up to trigger global “catastrophic” events, which are characterized by power laws, self-similarity and fractal behaviour. For a detailed account of self-organized criticality, the reader is referred to [Bak96] and [Jen98]. In this paper we consider a version of the forest-fire model which is defined on regular rooted trees or, more precisely, large finite subtrees thereof.

Let us start by introducing some notation about regular rooted trees. For the remainder of this paper, let $r \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ be fixed. The **r -regular rooted tree** is the unique tree (up to graph isomorphisms) in which one vertex, called the **root** of the tree, has degree r and every other vertex has degree $r + 1$. We denote the r -regular tree by T and the root of T by $\emptyset$. In slight abuse of notation, we will use the term T both for the r -regular tree as a graph and for its vertex set. Let $|u|$ denote the graph

distance of a vertex $u \in T$ from the root $\emptyset$. For two vertices $u, v \in T$, we say that u is the **parent** of v (or equivalently that v is a **child** of u) if u and v are neighbours and $|u| = |v| - 1$ holds. Moreover, for $u, v \in T$, we say that u is an **ancestor** of v (abbreviated by $u \preceq v$) if there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a sequence of vertices $z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k \in T$ such that $z_0 = u$, $z_k = v$ and z_{i-1} is the parent of z_i for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we say that $u \in T$ is in the n **th generation** of T if $|u| = n$, and we define

$$T_n := \{z \in T : |z| = n\}$$

to be the set of all vertices in the n th generation and

$$B_n := \{z \in T : |z| \leq n\} = \bigcup_{i=0}^n T_i$$

to be the set of all vertices with graph distance at most n from the root $\emptyset$.

In order to explain some further terminology, let V be a subset of T and let $\alpha = (\alpha_v)_{v \in V} \in \{0, 1\}^V$. We say that a vertex $v \in V$ is occupied in α if $\alpha_v = 1$, and we say that v is vacant in α if $\alpha_v = 0$. The set

$$T|_{\alpha,1} := \{v \in V : \alpha_v = 1\} \subset T$$

of occupied vertices in α induces a subgraph of T , which (in slight abuse of notation) we denote by $T|_{\alpha,1}$, too. For any vertex $z \in V$ the maximal connected component of $T|_{\alpha,1}$ containing z is called the **(occupied) cluster** of z in α . Moreover, if W is a connected subset of T , we say that a vertex $z \in T$ is the **root** of W if $z \in W$ holds and z is in the lowest generation among all vertices contained in W .

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We now define the forest-fire model on B_n . Informally, the model can be described as follows: Each vertex in B_n can be vacant or occupied. At time 0 all vertices are vacant. Then the process is governed by two opposing mechanisms: Vertices become occupied according to independent rate 1 Poisson processes, the so-called growth processes. Independently, vertices are hit by “lightning” according to independent rate $\lambda(n)$ Poisson processes (where $\lambda(n) > 0$), the so-called ignition processes. When a vertex is hit by lightning, its occupied cluster is instantaneously destroyed, i.e. it becomes vacant. Occupied vertices are usually pictured to be vegetated by a tree, so occupied clusters correspond to pieces of woodland and the destruction of clusters corresponds to the burning of forests by fires, which are caused by strokes of lightning. However, we avoid this terminology here because we already use the term tree in the graph-theoretic sense. A more formal definition of the forest-fire model goes as follows (where for a function $[0, \infty) \ni t \mapsto f_t \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $f_{t-} := \lim_{s \uparrow t} f_s$ for the left-sided limit at $t > 0$, provided the limit exists):

Definition 1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda(n) > 0$. Let $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ be a process with values in $(\{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0)^{[0, \infty) \times B_n}$ and initial condition $\eta_{0,z}^n = 0$ for $z \in B_n$. Suppose that for all $z \in B_n$ the process $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0}$ is càdlàg, i.e. right-continuous with left limits. For $z \in B_n$ and $t > 0$, let $C_{t-,z}^n$ denote the cluster of z in the configuration $(\eta_{t-,w}^n)_{w \in B_n}$.

Then $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ is called a **forest-fire process** on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ if the following conditions are satisfied:

[POISSON] The processes $(G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0}$ and $(I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0}$, $z \in B_n$, are independent Poisson processes with rates 1 and $\lambda(n)$, respectively.

[GROWTH] For all $t > 0$ and all $z \in B_n$ the following implications hold:

- (i) $G_{t^-,z} < G_{t,z} \Rightarrow \eta_{t,z}^n = 1$,
i.e. the growth of a tree at the site z at time t implies that the site z is occupied at time t ;
- (ii) $\eta_{t^-,z}^n < \eta_{t,z}^n \Rightarrow G_{t^-,z} < G_{t,z}$,
i.e. if the site z gets occupied at time t , there must have been the growth of a tree at the site z at time t .

[DESTRUCTION] For all $t > 0$ and all $z \in B_n$ the following implications hold:

- (i) $I_{t^-,z}^n < I_{t,z}^n \Rightarrow \forall w \in C_{t^-,z}^n : \eta_{t,w}^n = 0$,
i.e. if the cluster at z is hit by lightning at time t , it is destroyed at time t ;
- (ii) $\eta_{t^-,z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n \Rightarrow \exists v \in C_{t^-,z}^n : I_{t^-,v}^n < I_{t,v}^n$,
i.e. if the site z is destroyed at time t , its cluster must have been hit by lightning at time t .

Given independent Poisson processes $(G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0}$ and $(I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0}$, $z \in B_n$, with rates 1 and $\lambda(n)$, respectively, a unique corresponding forest-fire process $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ on B_n can be obtained by a graphical construction (see [Lig85]). For this construction it is crucial that B_n is finite. Using different methods, M. Dürre obtained results on existence and uniqueness of forest-fire models for all connected infinite graphs with bounded vertex degree (see [Dür06a], [Dür06b], [Dür09]).

One of the most interesting aspects about the forest-fire process on B_n is the question of what happens when n tends to infinity. Assuming that the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ exists in a suitable sense, we obtain a process on the infinite tree T , and the question thus concerns the dynamics of this limit process. It is intuitively clear that the growth mechanism carries over to the limit process but it is in general highly non-trivial what becomes of the destruction mechanism. Of course, the answer will depend strongly on the asymptotic behaviour of $\lambda(n)$. If a, b are functions from $\mathbb{N}$ to $(0, \infty)$, we write

- (i) $a(n) \ll b(n)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $a(n)/b(n) \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $a(n) \approx b(n)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $\log a(n)/\log b(n) \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Heuristically, one expects four regimes of $\lambda(n)$ with qualitatively different asymptotics, which we now describe informally.

1. If $\lambda(n) \ll r^n$, then the number of lightnings in B_n tends to 0 for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ no clusters can ever be destroyed so that the resulting process on T is simply a dynamical formulation of Bernoulli percolation.
2. If $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m^n$ for some $1 < m < r$, then in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ no finite clusters and no “thin” infinite clusters (i.e. those in which on average every vertex has fewer than m occupied child vertices) can be destroyed but “fat” infinite clusters (i.e. those in which on average every vertex has more than m occupied child vertices) should still be hit by lightning as soon as they appear. The resulting process on T should therefore have the following dynamics: Vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. If an infinite cluster becomes “fat”, it is instantaneously destroyed.
3. If $1/m^n \ll \lambda(n) \ll 1$ for every $m > 1$, then in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ no finite clusters can be destroyed but one would expect any infinite cluster to be dense enough that it is hit by lightning as soon as it appears. The resulting process on T should therefore have the following dynamics: Vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. If a cluster becomes infinite, it is instantaneously destroyed.
4. If $\lambda(n) = \lambda$ for some constant $\lambda > 0$, then the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ should yield a forest-fire model on T with the following dynamics: Vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all

vertices. Independently thereof and independently for all vertices, vertices are hit by lightning at rate λ . If a vertex is hit by lightning, its cluster is instantaneously destroyed.

In this paper, we give a partial result for regime 2 in the sense that we prove the conjectured asymptotics between time 0 and a deterministic time shortly *after* the first destruction of infinite clusters in the limit process on T . Before we proceed to the precise statement, we briefly comment on the other regimes and give a short overview of related results.

Regime 1 is the simplest case and the above statement on this regime can easily be made rigorous. The statement on regime 4 follows from work by M. Dürre in [Dür09]. In fact, the results of [Dür09] are much more general in the sense that they are not restricted to regular rooted trees but hold for all connected infinite graphs with bounded vertex degree. Regime 3 is undoubtedly the most difficult case with few rigorous results yet. It is even unknown whether the hypothetical limit process described in 3 exists at all. For the square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$, the corresponding process does not exist (conjectured by J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer in [vdBB04] and recently proven by D. Kiss, I. Manolescu and V. Sidoravicius in [KMS13]). Regime 3 is expected to behave similarly to the case where we first set $\lambda(n) = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and then take the double limit $\lim_{\lambda \downarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}$ (assuming that it exists in a suitable sense). In [vdBB06] this case was investigated for forest-fire models on the directed binary tree and on the square lattice. For forest-fire models on the square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$, an analogous heuristic description of four different regimes of the lightning rate can be found in the paper [RT09] by B. Ráth and B. Tóth. The main content of [RT09], however, is the analysis of a forest-fire model which arises as a modification of the Erdős-Rényi evolution and which also shows four regimes of the lightning rate with different asymptotic behaviour.

1.2 The pure growth process

In the following, if A is an event, we write 1_A for its indicator function, and if B is any set, we write $|B|$ for the number of elements in B (where $|B|$ can take values in $\mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{\infty\}$).

Definition 2. Let $(G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$, be independent rate 1 Poisson processes and let

$$\sigma_{t,z} := 1_{\{G_{t,z} > 0\}}, \quad t \geq 0, z \in T.$$

Then $(\sigma_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ is called a **pure growth process** on T . Moreover, for $x \in T$ and $t \geq 0$, we denote by $S_{t,x}$ the cluster of x in the configuration $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$, and for $t \geq 0$, we denote by

$$O_t := \{z \in T : |S_{t,z}| = \infty\}$$

the set of all vertices which are in an infinite cluster in the configuration $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$.

Above we claimed that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in regime 2, the forest-fire process on B_n should initially behave like the pure growth process on T until “fat” infinite clusters appear for the first time. We now want to make this statement more precise.

We first observe that for $t \geq 0$, the configuration $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$ is identical with Bernoulli percolation on T , where each vertex is occupied with probability $1 - e^{-t}$ and vacant with probability e^{-t} . From percolation theory it is well-known that there is a critical time $t_c := \log \frac{r}{r-1}$ such that a.s. for $t \leq t_c$ there is no infinite cluster in $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$ and for $t > t_c$ there are infinitely many infinite clusters in $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$. For $z \in T$ and $t \geq 0$, conditionally on the event $\{z \text{ is the root of } S_{t,z}\}$, the cluster $S_{t,z}$ can also be identified with a Galton-Watson process whose offspring distribution is binomially distributed with parameters r and $1 - e^{-t}$. In particular, the offspring distribution at time $t \geq 0$ has mean

$$m(t) := r(1 - e^{-t}) \tag{1}$$

and variance

$$\sigma^2(t) := r(1 - e^{-t})e^{-t}. \quad (2)$$

It is a consequence of the Kesten-Stigum theorem for Galton-Watson processes (see [KS66]) that for $z \in T$ and $t \geq 0$, there exists a random variable $W_{t,z}$ with values in $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|S_{t,z} \cap B_n|}{m(t)^n} = W_{t,z} \text{ a.s.} \quad (3)$$

and

$$W_{t,z} > 0 \text{ a.s. on the event } \{|S_{t,z}| = \infty\} \quad (4)$$

hold. (We will prove a different version later, see Proposition 2.) This suggests that if the lightning rate in the forest-fire process on B_n satisfies $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m^n$ for some $1 < m < r$, then the time threshold between “thin” and “fat” infinite clusters in the pure growth process should be the unique $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ with $m(\tau) = m$. In other words, in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, we expect to obtain a process on T which is equal to the pure growth process between time 0 and time τ and in which all infinite clusters are destroyed at time τ .

1.3 Statement of the main results

We will make the heuristics of the previous paragraph rigorous in the following way:

Definition 3. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\lambda(n) > 0$. We say that a forest-fire process $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ and a pure growth process $(\tilde{\sigma}_{t,z}, \tilde{G}_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ on T are **coupled in the canonical way** if they are realized on the same probability space and $(G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n} = (\tilde{G}_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ holds.

Theorem 1. Let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ and suppose that $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfies $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ be a forest-fire process on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ and let $(\sigma_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ be a pure growth process on T , coupled in the canonical way under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}$. For $t \geq 0$, let O_t be defined as in Definition 2. Then for all finite subsets $E \subset T$ and for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{z \in E, 0 \leq t \leq \tau - \delta} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \sigma_{t,z}| = 0, \forall z \in O_\tau \cap E \exists t \in (\tau - \delta, \tau + \delta) : \eta_{t-,z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n \right] = 1$$

holds.

The condition on λ in Theorem 1 can be written in a different way: Given $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ and a function $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, define the function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$g(n) := \lambda(n)m(\tau)^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (5)$$

Then it is easy to see that the following are equivalent:

- (i) $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) $\sqrt[n]{g(n)} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Under additional assumptions on g we can determine whether the destruction of the infinite clusters asymptotically occurs immediately *before* or *after* time τ :

Theorem 2. Consider the situation of Theorem 1. In particular, suppose that the function g defined by (5) satisfies $\sqrt[n]{g(n)} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(i) If g satisfies $g(n) \ll n/\log n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, then for all finite subsets $E \subset T$ and for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{z \in E, 0 \leq t \leq \tau} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \sigma_{t,z}| = 0, \forall z \in O_\tau \cap E \exists t \in (\tau, \tau + \delta) : \eta_{t-,z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n \right] = 1$$

holds, i.e. the infinite clusters are asymptotically destroyed immediately after time τ .

(ii) If there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that g satisfies $g(n) \gg \exp(n^\alpha)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, then for all finite subsets $E \subset T$ and for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{z \in E, 0 \leq t \leq \tau - \delta} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \sigma_{t,z}| = 0, \forall z \in O_\tau \cap E \exists t \in (\tau - \delta, \tau) : \eta_{t-,z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n \right] = 1$$

holds, i.e. the infinite clusters are asymptotically destroyed immediately before time τ .

Theorems 1 and 2 will be proved in Sections 2 and 3. Before, we give an interpretation of Theorem 1 in terms of self-destructive percolation.

1.4 Interpretation in terms of self-destructive percolation

Definition 4. Let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$, let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $(\sigma_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ be a pure growth process on T . For $t \geq 0$, let O_t be defined as in Definition 2. We define $\rho_{t,z}$ for $0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T$ in three steps: Firstly,

$$\rho_{t,z} := \sigma_{t,z}, \quad 0 \leq t < \tau, z \in T,$$

i.e. at time 0 all vertices are vacant and between time 0 and time τ vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices. Secondly,

$$\rho_{\tau,z} := \sigma_{\tau,z} 1_{\{z \notin O_\tau\}}, \quad z \in T,$$

i.e. at time τ all infinite occupied clusters are destroyed. Thirdly,

$$\rho_{t,z} := \rho_{\tau,z} \vee 1_{\{G_{t,z} - G_{\tau,z} > 0\}}, \quad \tau < t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T,$$

i.e. between time τ and time $\tau + \epsilon$ vertices become occupied at rate 1, independently for all vertices and independently of what happened between time 0 and time τ . Then $(\rho_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T}$ is called a **self-destructive percolation process** on T with parameters τ and ϵ .

Self-destructive percolation was first introduced by J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer in [vdBB04] and has subsequently also been studied in [vdBBV08] [vdBdL09] [AST13] and [ADCKS13]. For our purposes, the following property of self-destructive percolation is of particular importance:

Proposition 1. For all $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that a.s. there is no infinite cluster in the final configuration $(\rho_{\tau+\epsilon,z})_{z \in T}$ of a self-destructive percolation process $(\rho_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau+\epsilon, z \in T}$ on T with parameters τ and ϵ .

For the case where T is the binary tree (i.e. $r = 2$), this has already been proved by J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer ([vdBB04], Theorem 5.1). The proof of Proposition 1 for general r is based on an extension of the ideas in [vdBB04] and will be given in Section 4.

Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 imply that given $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$, we can choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that between time 0 and time $\tau + \epsilon$ every forest-fire process on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ converges to the self-destructive percolation process on T with parameters τ and ϵ . The formal statement is as follows:

Definition 5. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\lambda(n) > 0$. Moreover, let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ and $\epsilon > 0$. We say that a forest-fire process $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ and a self-destructive percolation process $(\tilde{\rho}_{t,z}, \tilde{G}_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T}$ on T with parameters τ and ϵ are **coupled in the canonical way** if they are realized on the same probability space and $(G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in B_n} = (\tilde{G}_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in B_n}$ holds.

Corollary 1. Let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$, let $\epsilon > 0$ be as in Proposition 1 and suppose that $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfies $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ be a forest-fire process on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ and let $(\rho_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T}$ be a self-destructive percolation process on T , coupled in the canonical way under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}$. Then for all finite subsets $E \subset T$ and for all $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{z \in E, 0 \leq t \leq \tau - \delta} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \rho_{t,z}| = 0, \sup_{z \in E, \tau + \delta \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \rho_{t,z}| = 0 \right] = 1 \quad (6)$$

holds.

Proof of Corollary 1 given Theorem 1 and Proposition 1. Let τ, ϵ, λ be as in Corollary 1. Likewise, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}, (\rho_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T}$ be as in Corollary 1. Moreover, let $E \subset T$ be a finite subset and let $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$. For the proof of (6) we may assume without loss of generality that E is a singleton, i.e. $E = \{x\}$ for some $x \in T$. In view of Theorem 1 it then suffices to prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{\tau + \delta \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon} |\eta_{t,x}^n - \rho_{t,x}| = 0 \right] = 1. \quad (7)$$

Before we continue with the proof, let us introduce some notation: For a non-empty subset $S \subset T$, let

$$\partial S := \{z \in T \setminus S : (\exists w \in S : z \text{ and } w \text{ are neighbours})\}$$

be the boundary of S in T . For $t \in [0, \tau + \epsilon]$ and $z \in T$, let $R_{t,z}$ denote the cluster of z in the configuration $(\eta_{t,w}^n)_{w \in B_n}$ and let

$$\overline{R}_{t,z} := \begin{cases} R_{t,z} \cup \partial R_{t,z} & \text{if } R_{t,z} \neq \emptyset, \\ \{z\} & \text{if } R_{t,z} = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

be its ‘‘closure’’. For $t \in [0, \tau + \epsilon]$, $z \in T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we similarly write $C_{t,z}^n$ for the cluster of z in the configuration $(\eta_{t,w}^n)_{w \in B_n}$ and define its closure by

$$\overline{C}_{t,z}^n := \begin{cases} C_{t,z}^n \cup \partial C_{t,z}^n & \text{if } C_{t,z}^n \neq \emptyset, \\ \{z\} & \text{if } C_{t,z}^n = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we denote by C_x^{fin} the (countable) set of all finite connected subsets of T which contain the site x .

Since $R_{\tau + \epsilon, x}$ (and hence $\overline{R}_{\tau + \epsilon, x}$) is a.s. finite by Proposition 1, we have the equality

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{\tau + \delta \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon} |\eta_{t,x}^n - \rho_{t,x}| = 0 \right] = \sum_{A \in C_x^{\text{fin}}} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{\tau + \delta \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon} |\eta_{t,x}^n - \rho_{t,x}| = 0, \overline{R}_{\tau + \epsilon, x} = A \right]$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So pick $A \in C_x^{\text{fin}}$ and set $\mathbb{A} := \{\overline{R}_{\tau + \epsilon, x} = A\}$. By the dominated convergence theorem, (7) holds once we know

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{\tau + \delta \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon} |\eta_{t,x}^n - \rho_{t,x}| = 0 \middle| \mathbb{A} \right] = 1. \quad (8)$$

It is thus enough to show (8).

Given the set A , by Theorem 1 we can choose a sequence $(\alpha(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\alpha(n) > 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(n) = 0$ such that the event

$$\mathbb{C}_n := \left\{ \forall z \in O_\tau \cap A \exists t \in (\tau - \alpha(n), \tau + \alpha(n)) : \eta_{t-,z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n, \right. \\ \left. \forall z \in A : G_{\tau-\alpha(n),z} = G_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}, I_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = 0 \right\}$$

(where O_τ is defined as in Definition 4 and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is assumed to be large enough to ensure $A \subset B_n$) satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[\mathbb{C}_n] = 1$. As an auxiliary step towards (8), we prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $A \subset B_n$ the inclusion

$$\mathbb{A} \cap \mathbb{C}_n \subset \left\{ \forall z \in A : \eta_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = \rho_{\tau+\alpha(n),z} \right\} \quad (9)$$

holds. So let $z \in A$, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough to ensure $A \subset B_n$ and suppose that the event $\mathbb{A} \cap \mathbb{C}_n$ occurs. We distinguish two cases:

Case 1: $z \in O_\tau$. Then there exists $t \in (\tau - \alpha(n), \tau + \alpha(n))$ such that $\eta_{t,z}^n = 0$ holds. Since $G_{\tau-\alpha(n),z} = G_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}$, it follows that we also have $\eta_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = 0$. On the other hand, the assumption $z \in O_\tau$ implies $\rho_{\tau,z} = 0$, and from $G_{\tau-\alpha(n),z} = G_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}$ we again deduce $\rho_{\tau+\alpha(n),z} = 0$. Hence we conclude $\eta_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = 0 = \rho_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}$.

Case 2: $z \notin O_\tau$. By construction $z \notin O_\tau$ implies $\bar{R}_{t,z} \subset \bar{R}_{\tau+\epsilon,z}$ for all $t \in [0, \tau + \epsilon]$. Since we assume $\bar{R}_{\tau+\epsilon,x} = A$ and $z \in A$, we also have $\bar{R}_{\tau+\epsilon,z} \subset A$. In particular we see that $\bar{R}_{\tau-\alpha(n),z} \subset A$ holds. Together with the fact that $I_{\tau-\alpha(n),w}^n = 0$ for all $w \in A$ this yields $\bar{C}_{\tau-\alpha(n),z}^n = \bar{R}_{\tau-\alpha(n),z} \subset A$. If we now use that $G_{\tau-\alpha(n),w} = G_{\tau+\alpha(n),w}$ and $I_{\tau-\alpha(n),w}^n = I_{\tau+\alpha(n),w}^n$ hold for all $w \in A$, it follows that $\bar{C}_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = \bar{R}_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}$, which shows $\eta_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = \rho_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}$.

Having proved (9), we now observe that the event

$$\mathbb{D}_n := \left\{ \forall z \in A : I_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = I_{\tau+\epsilon,z}^n \right\}$$

also satisfies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[\mathbb{D}_n] = 1$ and that

$$\mathbb{A} \cap \mathbb{D}_n \cap \left\{ \forall z \in A : \eta_{\tau+\alpha(n),z}^n = \rho_{\tau+\alpha(n),z} \right\} \subset \left\{ \sup_{z \in A, \tau+\alpha(n) \leq t \leq \tau+\epsilon} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \rho_{t,z}| = 0 \right\} \quad (10)$$

holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $A \subset B_n$. Since we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[\mathbb{C}_n \cap \mathbb{D}_n | \mathbb{A}] = 1$ and $\alpha(n) < \delta$ for n large enough, equation (8) follows from (9) and (10). $\square$

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We first prove some general properties of the pure growth process in Section 2.1 before we come to the core of the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 2.2.

2.1 Properties of the pure growth process

Let $(\sigma_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ be a pure growth process on T under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}$. For $x \in T$, $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $S_{t,x}$ denote the cluster of x in the configuration $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$ and let

$$S_{t,x}^n := S_{t,x} \cap B_n$$

be the set of vertices in $S_{t,x}$ whose graph distance from the root $\emptyset$ is at most n . Recall the definition of $m(t)$ and $\sigma^2(t)$ in equations (1) and (2). We start with some estimates for the first and second moment of $|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|$ in the supercritical case $t > t_c$:

Lemma 1. *Let $t > t_c$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then we have*

$$1 - e^{-t} \leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \right] \leq \frac{m(t)}{m(t) - 1}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|^2}{m(t)^{2n}} \right] \leq \left(\frac{\sigma^2(t)}{m(t)(m(t) - 1)} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{m(t)}{m(t) - 1} \right)^2. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Let $t > t_c$ and abbreviate $m := m(t)$, $\sigma^2 := \sigma^2(t)$. We will prove (11) and (12) by means of Galton-Watson theory. So let $X_{n,i}$, $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$, be i.i.d. $\{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ -valued random variables under some probability measure $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ such that $X_{n,i}$ is binomially distributed with parameters r and $1 - e^{-t}$. (In particular, $X_{n,i}$ has mean m and variance σ^2 .) Define Z_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, recursively by $Z_0 := 1$ and $Z_n := \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{n-1}} X_{n,i}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and set $S_n := \sum_{i=0}^n Z_i$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then Z_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is a supercritical Galton-Watson process, and Z_n has mean

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_n] = m^n \quad (13)$$

and variance

$$\mathbf{Var}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_n] = \sigma^2 m^{n-1} \frac{m^n - 1}{m - 1} \quad (14)$$

(see e.g. [Har63], Section I.5). Moreover, let U be a $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variable on the same probability space which is independent from $X_{n,i}$, $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$, and Bernoulli distributed with parameter $1 - e^{-t}$. Then the distribution of $|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|$ under $\mathbf{P}$ and the distribution of US_n under $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}$ coincide, and $\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [U] = 1 - e^{-t} \leq 1$. For the proof of (11) and (12), it therefore suffices to show the following inequalities for $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$m^n \leq \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [S_n] \leq \frac{m}{m - 1} m^n, \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [S_n^2] \leq \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{m(m - 1)} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{m}{m - 1} \right)^2 m^{2n}. \quad (16)$$

Proof of (15): Using equation (13), we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [S_n] = \sum_{i=0}^n m^i \leq \frac{m}{m - 1} m^n$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which proves both sides of (15).

Proof of (16): For $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we easily deduce from equations (13) and (14)

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_i^2] = \sigma^2 m^{i-1} \frac{m^i - 1}{m - 1} + m^{2i} \leq \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{m(m - 1)} + 1 \right) m^{2i}.$$

Furthermore, for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $i < j$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_i Z_j] = \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_i^2] m^{j-i} \leq \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{m(m - 1)} + 1 \right) m^{i+j}.$$

We thus obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [S_n^2] = \sum_{i,j=0}^n \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathbf{P}}} [Z_i Z_j] \leq \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{m(m - 1)} + 1 \right) \sum_{i,j=0}^n m^{i+j}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The last sum can be bounded from above by

$$\sum_{i,j=0}^n m^{i+j} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^n m^i \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{m}{m-1} \right)^2 m^{2n},$$

which completes the proof of (16). $\square$

Recall equations (3) and (4). We now want to prove similar statements which are uniform in t . The price we pay for this kind of uniformity is that in contrast to (3) and (4), our statements are in probability rather than almost surely. The precise formulation is as follows:

Proposition 2. *Let $x \in T$ and $a > t_c$. Then we have*

$$\lim_{C \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}: n > |x|} \sup_{t \in [a, \infty)} \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,x}^n| > Cm(t)^n] = 0 \quad (17)$$

and

$$\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}: n > |x|} \sup_{t \in [a, \infty)} \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,x}^n| < cm(t)^n \mid |S_{t,x}| = \infty] = 0. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Let $a > t_c$.

Step 1: We first prove (17) and (18) for $x = \emptyset$.

For $C > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [a, \infty)$, the Markov inequality and equation (11) yield

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq C \right] \leq \frac{1}{C} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \right] \leq \frac{1}{C} \frac{m(t)}{m(t)-1}. \quad (19)$$

Since $m(t)$ is bounded away from 1 for $t \in [a, \infty)$, this implies (17) for $x = \emptyset$.

As preparatory work for the proof of (18) we next show that there exist $c, \delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{t \in [a, \infty)} \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq c \right] \geq \delta \quad (20)$$

holds. For arbitrary $0 < c < C$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [a, \infty)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - e^{-t} &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \right] \\ &\leq c + C \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq c \right] + \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} 1_{\left\{ \frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq C \right\}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to (11) and the second inequality is obtained by distinguishing in which of the intervals $[0, c)$, $[c, C)$, $[C, \infty)$ the rescaled cluster size $|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|/m(t)^n$ lies. The last summand can be bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} 1_{\left\{ \frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq C \right\}} \right] &\leq \left(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|^2}{m(t)^{2n}} \right] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq C \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{C^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\sigma^2(t)}{m(t)(m(t)-1)} + 1 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{m(t)}{m(t)-1} \right)^{3/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we first use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and then apply equations (12) and (19). We thus obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq c \right] \geq \frac{1}{C} \left(1 - e^{-t} - c - \frac{1}{C^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\sigma^2(t)}{m(t)(m(t)-1)} + 1 \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{m(t)}{m(t)-1} \right)^{3/2} \right).$$

Since $\sigma^2(t)/m(t) = e^{-t}$ and $m(t)$ is bounded away from 1 for $t \in [a, \infty)$, this proves the existence of $c, \delta > 0$ satisfying (20).

We now prove (18). Intuitively, (18) follows from (20) because conditionally on $\{|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty\}$, the cluster $S_{t,\emptyset}$ contains arbitrarily many independent subtrees in which an asymptotic growth of the form (20) can occur. The formal proof goes as follows:

Let $\epsilon > 0$. We first construct a finite set $U \subset [a, \infty)$ such that

$$\forall t \in [a, \infty) \exists u \in U : u \leq t, \mathbf{P} [|S_{u,\emptyset}| = \infty] \geq \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty] - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \quad (21)$$

holds: Define $f : [a, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $f(t) := \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty]$, and

$$R := \left\{ f(a) + i \frac{\epsilon}{4} : i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\} \cap [0, 1].$$

Then R is clearly finite. Since f is continuous, strictly monotone increasing and maps $[a, \infty)$ onto $[f(a), 1)$, it follows that $U := f^{-1}(R)$ is finite and satisfies (21).

Let $\delta, c > 0$ be as in equation (20). Given ϵ, δ, c , we choose constants $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ in the following way: First, we take $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(1 - \delta)^k \leq \epsilon/4$ holds. Then we choose $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall u \in U : \mathbf{P} [\{|S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k\} \triangle \{|S_{u,\emptyset}| = \infty\}] \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \quad (22)$$

holds, where $\triangle$ denotes the symmetric difference: For each individual $u \in U$ such an l exists because of the Kesten-Stigum theorem (whose full statement is of course much stronger), and since the set U is finite, we can choose l uniformly for all $u \in U$. Finally, we set $\tilde{c} := c/r^l$. Now let $n \in \{l+1, l+2, \dots\}$ and $t \in [a, \infty)$ be arbitrary. Given t , choose $u \in U$ as in (21). Then we can make the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty \right] &\geq \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{u,\emptyset}| = \infty \right] \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k \right] - \frac{\epsilon}{4}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where the first inequality holds because of $u \leq t$ and the second inequality follows from (22). On the event $\{|S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k\}$, let $Z_{u,1}, \dots, Z_{u,k}$ be an enumeration of the “first” k vertices in $S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l$. For $z \in T$ let

$$\hat{S}_{t,z} := \{v \in S_{t,z} : z \preceq v\} \quad (24)$$

be the part of the cluster of $S_{t,z}$ which lies in the r -regular rooted subtree of T originating from z and let

$$\hat{S}_{t,z}^n := \hat{S}_{t,z} \cap B_n. \quad (25)$$

Since $u \leq t$, on the event $\{|S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k\}$, we have $Z_{u,i} \in S_{t,\emptyset}$ and hence $\hat{S}_{t,Z_{u,i}} \subset S_{t,\emptyset}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k \right] &\geq \mathbf{P} \left[\exists i \in \{1, \dots, k\} : \frac{|\hat{S}_{t,Z_{u,i}}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k \right] \\ &= \left(1 - \left(1 - \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-l}|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c} \middle| \sigma_{t,\emptyset} = 1 \right] \right)^k \right) \mathbf{P} [|S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k], \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the last equality follows from the following observations about the pure growth process:

- The configuration on B_l at time u and the configuration on $T \setminus B_l$ at time t are independent.
- The configurations at time t on the r -regular rooted subtrees originating from the vertices in T_l are independent and identically distributed as the configuration at time t on the entire tree T .

Using the inequality $\tilde{c}m(t)^l \leq c$ and the defining equations for c , δ and k , we can estimate the first factor in (26) by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \left(1 - \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-l}|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c} \middle| \sigma_{t,\emptyset} = 1 \right] \right)^k &\geq 1 - \left(1 - \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-l}|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c} \right] \right)^k \\ &\geq 1 - \left(1 - \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-l}|}{m(t)^{n-l}} \geq c \right] \right)^k \\ &\geq 1 - (1 - \delta)^k \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The second factor in (26) is bounded from below by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} [|S_{u,\emptyset} \cap T_l| \geq k] &\geq \mathbf{P} [|S_{u,\emptyset}| = \infty] - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty] - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

because of (22) and (21). Putting equations (23), (26), (27) and (28) together, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c}, |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty \right] \geq \mathbf{P} [|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty] - \epsilon.$$

Since this holds uniformly for $n \in \{l+1, l+2, \dots\}$ and $t \in [a, \infty)$ and since $\mathbf{P} [|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty] \geq \mathbf{P} [|S_{a,\emptyset}| = \infty] > 0$ for all $t \in [a, \infty)$, we conclude

$$\sup_{n \in \{l+1, l+2, \dots\}} \sup_{t \in [a, \infty)} \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \tilde{c} \middle| |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\mathbf{P} [|S_{a,\emptyset}| = \infty]}. \quad (29)$$

Additionally, we also have the trivial estimate

$$\sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, l\}} \sup_{t \in [a, \infty)} \mathbf{P} \left[\frac{|S_{t,\emptyset}^n|}{m(t)^n} \geq \frac{1}{r^l} \middle| |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty \right] = 1$$

for $n \in \{1, \dots, l\}$. Together with (29) this proves (18) for $x = \emptyset$.

Step 2: We now prove equations (17) and (18) for general $x \in T$. So let $x \in T$ and let $n \in \{|x|+1, |x|+2, \dots\}$, $t \in [a, \infty)$. For both equations we distinguish which vertex z of the finitely many ancestors of x is the root of the cluster $S_{t,x}$ (the case $S_{t,x} = \emptyset$ being irrelevant) and then use the fact that the r -regular rooted subtree originating from z is isomorphic to T . Let $\hat{S}_{t,z}$ and $\hat{S}_{t,z}^n$ be defined as in (24) and (25) respectively. Regarding (17) we then obtain for all $C > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,x}^n| > Cm(t)^n] &= \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,x}^n| > Cm(t)^n, z \text{ is the root of } S_{t,x}] \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \mathbf{P}[|\hat{S}_{t,z}^n| > Cm(t)^n] \\ &= \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-|z|}| > Cm(t)^n] \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-|z|}| > Cm(a)^{|z|} \cdot m(t)^{n-|z|}], \end{aligned}$$

and regarding (18) we similarly obtain for all $c > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,x}^n| < cm(t)^n \mid |S_{t,x}| = \infty] &= \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \frac{\mathbf{P}[|S_{t,x}^n| < cm(t)^n, z \text{ is the root of } S_{t,x}, |S_{t,x}| = \infty]}{\mathbf{P}[|S_{t,x}| = \infty]} \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \frac{\mathbf{P}[|\hat{S}_{t,z}^n| < cm(t)^n, |\hat{S}_{t,z}| = \infty]}{\mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty]} \\ &= \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \frac{\mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-|z|}| < cm(t)^n, |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty]}{\mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty]} \\ &\leq \sum_{z \in T: z \preceq x} \mathbf{P}[|S_{t,\emptyset}^{n-|z|}| < cr^{|z|} \cdot m(t)^{n-|z|} \mid |S_{t,\emptyset}| = \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

Together with Step 1 this completes the proof of (17) and (18). $\square$

2.2 The core of the proof of Theorem 1

Throughout this section, consider the setup of Theorem 1: Let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$ and suppose that $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfies $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\eta_{t,z}^n, G_{t,z}, I_{t,z}^n)_{t \geq 0, z \in B_n}$ be a forest-fire process on B_n with parameter $\lambda(n)$ and let $(\sigma_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{t \geq 0, z \in T}$ be a pure growth process on T , coupled in the canonical way under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}$. As before, we use the following notation: For $x \in T$, $t \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $S_{t,x}$ denote the cluster of x in the configuration $(\sigma_{t,z})_{z \in T}$ of the pure growth process at time t , let $S_{t,x}^n := S_{t,x} \cap B_n$ and let $O_t := \{z \in T : |S_{t,z}| = \infty\}$. Similarly, let $C_{t,x}^n$ denote the cluster of x in the configuration $(\eta_{t,z}^n)_{z \in B_n}$ of the forest-fire process at time t . Choose an arbitrary function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ which satisfies

$$1 \ll f(n) \ll \frac{n}{\log n} \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (30)$$

Define a corresponding sequence $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of time points in such a way that $\lambda(n) = f(n)/m(\tau_n)^n$ holds, i.e.

$$\tau_n := m^{-1} \left(\sqrt[n]{\frac{f(n)}{\lambda(n)}} \right),$$

where

$$m^{-1}(y) = \log \frac{r}{r-y}, \quad y \in [0, r),$$

denotes the inverse function of $m(t)$, $t \geq 0$. Since $\sqrt[n]{\lambda(n)} \rightarrow 1/m(\tau)$ and $\sqrt[n]{f(n)} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (the first limit follows from $\lambda(n) \approx 1/m(\tau)^n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, the second limit is a consequence of (30)), we then have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n = \tau. \quad (31)$$

In particular, for all $x \in T$ it is true that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[|S_{\tau_n, x}| = |S_{\tau, x}|] = 1. \quad (32)$$

Equations (31) and (32) imply that for the proof of Theorem 1, it is enough to verify the following statement: For all finite subsets $E \subset T$ and for all $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{z \in E, 0 \leq t \leq \tau_n} |\eta_{t,z}^n - \sigma_{t,z}| = 0, \forall z \in O_{\tau_n} \cap E \exists t \in (\tau_n, \tau_n + \delta) : \eta_{t^-, z}^n > \eta_{t,z}^n \right] = 1 \quad (33)$$

holds.

Since E is finite, we may assume without loss of generality that E is a singleton, i.e. $E = \{x\}$ for some $x \in T$. So let $x \in T$ and $\delta > 0$ be fixed and define

$$\mathbf{Q}_n[\cdot] := \mathbf{P}[\cdot \mid |S_{\tau_n, x}| = \infty]$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfy $\tau_n > t_c$. (Due to (31) the case $\tau_n \leq t_c$ can only occur for finitely many n .) It then suffices to prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \tau_n} |\eta_{t,x}^n - \sigma_{t,x}| = 0 \right] = 1 \quad (34)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists t \in (\tau_n, \tau_n + \delta) : \eta_{t^-, x}^n > \eta_{t,x}^n = 0 \right] = 1. \quad (35)$$

Before we go into the details, let us briefly outline the strategy for the proof of (34) and (35): We investigate how the vertices in the cluster $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ of the pure growth process on B_n at time τ_n behave in the forest-fire process on B_n between time 0 and time τ_n . We will see that typically destruction only occurs in high generations of $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ and only few vertices in $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ are affected by destruction. This has two consequences: Firstly, it shows that (34) holds indeed. Secondly, it implies that if $S_{\tau_n, x}$ is infinite, then the cluster $C_{\tau_n, x}^n$ has the same order of magnitude as $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$, namely $m(\tau_n)^n$. But since $\lambda(n)m(\tau_n)^n = f(n)$ and $f(n) \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that $C_{\tau_n, x}^n$ is typically hit by ignition soon after time τ_n , which proves (35).

We now make these arguments rigorous. In doing so, we will use the following Landau-type notation: If X^n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is a sequence of real-valued random variables under the probability measure $\mathbf{P}$ and $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a non-negative function, we write

$$\begin{aligned} X^n &\stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} O(h(n)) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty : \Leftrightarrow \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[|X^n| \leq ch(n)] = 1; \\ X^n &\stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} \Omega(h(n)) \text{ for } n \rightarrow \infty : \Leftrightarrow \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left[|X^n| \geq \frac{1}{c}h(n)\right] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2. *Let*

$$\iota^n := \inf \left\{ t \in [0, \tau_n) : \left(\exists z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n : I_{(\tau_n - t)^-, z}^n < I_{\tau_n - t, z}^n \right) \right\} \wedge \tau_n$$

be the amount of time between τ_n and the last time of lightning in $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ before τ_n . (On the event $\{\forall z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n : I_{\tau_n, z}^n = 0\}$ we have $\iota^n = \tau_n$ by definition.) Then we have

$$\iota^n \stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} \Omega \left(\frac{1}{f(n)} \right) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $c, \tilde{c} > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\tau_n \geq 1/(cf(n))$ and let

$$\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}} := \{ |S_{\tau_n, x}^n| \leq \tilde{c}m(\tau_n)^n \}. \quad (36)$$

By Proposition 2, equation (17), it suffices to show

$$\forall \tilde{c} > 0 : \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left[\iota^n < \frac{1}{cf(n)}, \mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}} \right] = 0. \quad (37)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left[\iota^n < \frac{1}{cf(n)}, \mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}} \right] &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\mathbf{P} \left[\iota^n < \frac{1}{cf(n)} \middle| S_{\tau_n, x}^n \right] 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{1}{cf(n)} \lambda(n) |S_{\tau_n, x}^n| \right) \right) 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &\leq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{c}}{c} \right) \xrightarrow{c \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (37). □

Lemma 3. *Let*

$$N^n := \sum_{z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n} I_{\tau_n, z}^n$$

be the number of lightnings in $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ up to time τ_n . Then we have

$$N^n \stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} \mathcal{O}(f(n)) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $c, \tilde{c} > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}$ be defined as in (36). By Proposition 2, equation (17), it suffices to show

$$\forall \tilde{c} > 0 : \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} [N^n > cf(n), \mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}] = 0. \quad (38)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} [N^n > cf(n), \mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}] &\leq \frac{1}{cf(n)} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} [N^n 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{cf(n)} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} [\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} [N^n | S_{\tau_n, x}^n] 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{cf(n)} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_n} [\tau_n \lambda(n) |S_{\tau_n, x}^n| 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, \tilde{c}}}] \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_n \tilde{c}}{c} \end{aligned}$$

and (by (31))

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau_n \tilde{c}}{c} = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau \tilde{c}}{c} = 0,$$

which proves (38). $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let*

$$K^n := \max \{k \in \{0, \dots, n\} : (\exists z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n \cap T_{n-k} : I_{\tau_n, z}^n > 0)\} \vee (-1)$$

be the “depth” of lightning in $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ up to time τ_n . (On the event $\{\forall z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n : I_{\tau_n, z}^n = 0\}$ we have $K^n = -1$ by definition.) Then we have

$$K^n \stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} \mathcal{O}(\log n) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $c, \tilde{c} > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq \lfloor c \log n \rfloor + 2$ and let

$$\mathbb{E}_{n, c, \tilde{c}} := \left\{ |S_{\tau_n, x}^{n - \lfloor c \log n \rfloor - 1}| \leq \tilde{c} m(\tau_n)^{n - \lfloor c \log n \rfloor - 1} \right\}.$$

By Proposition 2, equation (17), it suffices to show

$$\forall \tilde{c} > 0 : \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}[K^n > c \log n, \mathbb{E}_{n, c, \tilde{c}}] = 0. \quad (39)$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[K^n > c \log n, \mathbb{E}_{n, c, \tilde{c}}] &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\mathbf{P} \left[\exists z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^{n - \lfloor c \log n \rfloor - 1} : I_{\tau_n, z}^n > 0 \mid S_{\tau_n, x}^{n - \lfloor c \log n \rfloor - 1} \right] 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, c, \tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\left(1 - \exp \left(-\tau_n \lambda(n) |S_{\tau_n, x}^{n - \lfloor c \log n \rfloor - 1}| \right) \right) 1_{\mathbb{E}_{n, c, \tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &\leq 1 - \exp \left(-\tilde{c} \tau_n \frac{f(n)}{m(\tau_n)^{\lfloor c \log n \rfloor + 1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Equations (30) and (31) imply that for n large enough $f(n) \leq n$ and $m(\tau_n) > 1$ hold and hence

$$\tau_n \frac{f(n)}{m(\tau_n)^{\lfloor c \log n \rfloor + 1}} \leq \tau_n \frac{n}{m(\tau_n)^{c \log n}} = \tau_n \exp((\log n)(1 - c \log m(\tau_n))).$$

By (31), for $c > 1/\log m(\tau)$ we thus obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n \frac{f(n)}{m(\tau_n)^{\lfloor c \log n \rfloor + 1}} = 0,$$

which proves (39). $\square$

Lemma 5. *Let*

$$J^n := \max \{j \in \{0, \dots, n\} : (\exists z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n \cap T_{n-j} \exists t \in (0, \tau_n] : \eta_{t^-, z}^n > \eta_{t, z}^n)\} \vee (-1)$$

be the “depth” of destruction in $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ up to time τ_n . (On the event $\{\forall z \in S_{\tau_n, x}^n \forall t \in (0, \tau_n] : \eta_{t^-, z}^n \leq \eta_{t, z}^n\}$ we have $J^n = -1$ by definition.) Then we have

$$J^n \stackrel{\mathbf{P}}{=} \mathcal{O}(f(n) \log n) \quad \text{for } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $c, \tilde{c} > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$\mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}} := \left\{ \iota^n \geq \frac{1}{\tilde{c}f(n)}, N^n \leq \tilde{c}f(n), K^n \leq \tilde{c} \log n \right\}.$$

By Lemmas 2, 3 and 4, it suffices to show

$$\forall \tilde{c} > 0 : \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}_n [J^n > cf(n) \log n, \mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}}] = 0. \quad (40)$$

Let $(Z_i^n)_{i=1,\dots,N^n}$ be an enumeration of the sites in $S_{\tau_n,x}^n$ which are hit by ignition up to time τ_n , where we count these sites with multiplicity, i.e. for each $z \in S_{\tau_n,x}^n$ the relation $|\{i \in \{1, \dots, N^n\} : Z_i^n = z\}| = I_{\tau_n,z}^n$ holds. (On the event $\{N^n = 0\}$ the sequence $(Z_i^n)_{i=1,\dots,N^n}$ is empty.) For $t \geq 0$ and $z \in T$ let

$$A_{t,z} := |z| - \min\{|w| : w \in S_{t,z}\}$$

be the difference between the generation of z and the lowest generation which is contained in the cluster of z in the pure growth process at time t . (On the event $\{S_{t,z} = \emptyset\}$ we have $A_{t,z} = -\infty$.) Now suppose that $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2$, $z \in T$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ are given: Using the inclusion $\{A_{t_1,z} \geq k\} \subset \{A_{t_2,z} \geq k\}$ and the fact that the growth processes at different sites are independent, one can show that

$$\mathbf{P}[A_{t_1,z} \geq k | (\sigma_{t_2,w})_{w \in T}] = \left(\frac{1 - e^{-t_1}}{1 - e^{-t_2}} \right)^{k+1} 1_{\{A_{t_2,z} \geq k\}}.$$

Additionally, let $\mathcal{S}_{t_2}\mathcal{I}^n := \sigma((\sigma_{t_2,w})_{w \in T}, (I_{t,w}^n)_{t \geq 0, w \in B_n})$ denote the σ -field generated by the configuration of the pure growth process at time t_2 and all ignition processes. Since the growth processes and the ignition processes are independent and since $A_{t_1,z}$ only depends on the growth processes, it follows from the previous equation that

$$\mathbf{P}[A_{t_1,z} \geq k | \mathcal{S}_{t_2}\mathcal{I}^n] = \left(\frac{1 - e^{-t_1}}{1 - e^{-t_2}} \right)^{k+1} 1_{\{A_{t_2,z} \geq k\}} \leq \left(\frac{1 - e^{-t_1}}{1 - e^{-t_2}} \right)^{k+1}. \quad (41)$$

We now relate these preliminaries with the proof of (40): Assume that n is large enough so that $cf(n) \log n \geq \tilde{c} \log n$ and $\tau_n \geq 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))$ hold. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \{J^n > cf(n) \log n, \mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}}\} &\subset \left\{ \exists i \in \{1, \dots, N^n\} : (n - |Z_i^n|) + A_{\tau_n - 1/(\tilde{c}f(n)), Z_i^n} > cf(n) \log n, \mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}} \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ \exists i \in \{1, \dots, N^n\} : A_{\tau_n - 1/(\tilde{c}f(n)), Z_i^n} > cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n, \mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

holds, where the first inclusion uses $\mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}} \subset \{\iota^n \geq 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))\}$ and the second inclusion is due to the fact that $\mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}} \subset \{\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N^n\} : (n - |Z_i^n|) \leq \tilde{c} \log n\}$. Furthermore, we deduce from (42) and (41) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}[J^n > cf(n) \log n, \mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}}] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^n} 1_{\{A_{\tau_n - 1/(\tilde{c}f(n)), Z_i^n} > cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n\}} 1_{\mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{P}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^n} \sum_{z \in S_{\tau_n,x}^n} \mathbf{P}[A_{\tau_n - 1/(\tilde{c}f(n)), z} \geq \lfloor cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n \rfloor + 1 | \mathcal{S}_{\tau_n}\mathcal{I}^n] 1_{\{Z_i^n = z\}} 1_{\mathbb{F}_{n,\tilde{c}}} \right] \\ &\leq \tilde{c}f(n) \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\tau_n + 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))}}{1 - e^{-\tau_n}} \right)^{\lfloor cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n \rfloor + 2} \end{aligned}$$

holds. Now let n be large enough so that $f(n) \leq n$ holds (which is possible by (30)). Then

$$\tilde{c}f(n) \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\tau_n + 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))}}{1 - e^{-\tau_n}} \right)^{\lfloor cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n \rfloor + 2} \leq \tilde{c}n \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\tau_n + 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))}}{1 - e^{-\tau_n}} \right)^{cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n}.$$

In order to determine the behaviour of the last term for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} & n \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\tau_n + 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))}}{1 - e^{-\tau_n}} \right)^{cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n} \\ &= \exp \left(\log n + (cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n) \log \left(1 - \frac{e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1}{e^{\tau_n} - 1} \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left((\log n) \left(1 + \left(c - \frac{\tilde{c}}{f(n)} \right) f(n) \log \left(1 - \frac{e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1}{e^{\tau_n} - 1} \right) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Since $f(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see (30) and (31)), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\tau_n} - 1}{e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1} \log \left(1 - \frac{e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1}{e^{\tau_n} - 1} \right) &= \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{\log(1 - y)}{y} = -1, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{c}f(n) \left(e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1 \right) &= \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{e^y - 1}{y} = 1, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{c}(e^{\tau_n} - 1)} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{c}(e^\tau - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying these equations yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) \log \left(1 - \frac{e^{1/(\tilde{c}f(n))} - 1}{e^{\tau_n} - 1} \right) = \frac{-1}{\tilde{c}(e^\tau - 1)}. \quad (44)$$

From (43) and (44) we conclude that for $c > \tilde{c}(e^\tau - 1)$ we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{c}n \left(\frac{1 - e^{-\tau_n + 1/(\tilde{c}f(n))}}{1 - e^{-\tau_n}} \right)^{cf(n) \log n - \tilde{c} \log n} = 0,$$

which proves (40). $\square$

Proof of (34) and (35) (and hence of Theorem 1). Equation (34) is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5 and the fact that $f(n) \log n \ll n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ by (30).

Proof of (35): Let $c > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$\mathbb{G}_{n,c} := \left\{ \frac{|S_{\tau_n,x}^n|}{m(\tau_n)^n} \geq \frac{1}{c}, N^n \leq cf(n), J^n \leq cf(n) \log n \right\}.$$

By Proposition 2, equation (18), Lemma 3 und Lemma 5, it suffices to show

$$\forall c > 0 : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists t \in (\tau_n, \tau_n + \delta) : \eta_{t^-,x}^n > \eta_{t,x}^n \mid \mathbb{G}_{n,c} \right] = 1. \quad (45)$$

We first observe that

$$|S_{\tau_n,x}^n \setminus C_{\tau_n,x}^n| \leq N^n \frac{r^{J^n+1} - 1}{r - 1} \quad (46)$$

holds: In the case where $J^n = -1$ we have $C_{\tau_n, x}^n = S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ so that (46) holds indeed. In the case where $J^n \geq 0$ the cluster $C_{\tau_n, x}^n$ can only differ from $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ in the maximal subtrees of $S_{\tau_n, x}^n$ whose roots are in T_{n-J^n} . Each of these maximal subtrees can have at most $\sum_{j=0}^{J^n} r^j = \frac{r^{J^n+1}-1}{r-1}$ vertices. Moreover, since these subtrees are disconnected, at most N^n of them can have been affected by destruction up to time τ_n . This proves (46) in the second case. On the event $\mathbb{G}_{n,c}$, we hence have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\tau_n, x}^n \setminus C_{\tau_n, x}^n| &\leq cf(n) \frac{r^{cf(n) \log n + 1} - 1}{r - 1} \\ &\leq cf(n) r^{cf(n) \log n + 1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |C_{\tau_n, x}^n| &= |S_{\tau_n, x}^n| - |S_{\tau_n, x}^n \setminus C_{\tau_n, x}^n| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{c} m(\tau_n)^n - cf(n) r^{cf(n) \log n + 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

For $t \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{F}_t^n := \sigma((G_{s,w})_{0 \leq s \leq t, w \in T}, (I_{s,w}^n)_{0 \leq s \leq t, w \in B_n})$ denote the σ -field generated by the growth and ignition processes up to time t . We then deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists t \in (\tau_n, \tau_n + \delta) : \eta_{t^-, x}^n > \eta_{t, x}^n, \mathbb{G}_{n,c} \right] &\geq \mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists z \in C_{\tau_n, x}^n : I_{\tau_n + \delta, z}^n > I_{\tau_n, z}^n, \mathbb{G}_{n,c} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_n} \left[\mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists z \in C_{\tau_n, x}^n : I_{\tau_n + \delta, z}^n > I_{\tau_n, z}^n \mid \mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}^n \right] 1_{\mathbb{G}_{n,c}} \right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Q}_n} \left[(1 - \exp(-\delta \lambda(n) |C_{\tau_n, x}^n|)) 1_{\mathbb{G}_{n,c}} \right] \\ &\geq \left(1 - \exp \left(-\delta \lambda(n) \left(\frac{1}{c} m(\tau_n)^n - cf(n) r^{cf(n) \log n + 1} \right) \right) \right) \mathbf{Q}_n [\mathbb{G}_{n,c}], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the last inequality follows from (47). In order to determine the behaviour of the exponential argument for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we consider the two summands separately: For the first summand we clearly have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(n) m(\tau_n)^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) = \infty \quad (49)$$

(see (30)). The second summand can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(n) f(n) r^{cf(n) \log n} &= f(n)^2 \frac{r^{cf(n) \log n}}{m(\tau_n)^n} \\ &= \exp(2 \log f(n) + (c \log r) f(n) \log n - (\log m(\tau_n)) n) \\ &= \exp \left(n \left(2 \frac{\log f(n)}{n} + (c \log r) \frac{f(n) \log n}{n} - \log m(\tau_n) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (30), the function f satisfies $f(n) \ll n / \log n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, and this also implies $\log f(n) \ll n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using these asymptotics and recalling (31), we thus conclude

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(2 \frac{\log f(n)}{n} + (c \log r) \frac{f(n) \log n}{n} - \log m(\tau_n) \right) = -\log m(\tau)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(n) f(n) r^{cf(n) \log n} = 0. \quad (50)$$

Putting (48), (49) and (50) together yields the proof of (45). $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 2

Consider the same setup as in Section 2.2; additionally, let $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be defined as in (5). By assumption, g satisfies $\sqrt[n]{g(n)} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Part (i): Suppose that g also satisfies $g(n) \ll n/\log n$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then the function f of Section 2.2 can be chosen in such a way that for n large enough $f(n) \geq g(n)$ holds. Since m^{-1} is monotone increasing, we conclude that for n large enough

$$\tau_n = m^{-1} \left(m(\tau) \sqrt[n]{\frac{f(n)}{g(n)}} \right) \geq \tau$$

holds. By (31) we also have $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Theorem 2 (i) therefore follows from (33).

Part (ii): Suppose that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that g satisfies $g(n) \gg \exp(n^\alpha)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Choose $\beta, \gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that $0 < \beta < \alpha$ and $0 < 1 - \beta < \gamma$ hold. Take the function f of Section 2.2 to be $f(n) := n^\gamma$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, (30) is satisfied for this choice of f , and for n large enough we have $f(n) \leq g(n)$. Hence, similar arguments as above show that for n large enough $\tau_n \leq \tau$ holds. Again, by (31) we also have $\tau_n \rightarrow \tau$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using these facts and arguing analogously to Section 2.2, we conclude that for Theorem 2 (ii) it suffices to prove

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{Q}_n \left[\exists t \in (\tau_n, \tau) : \eta_{t^-, x}^n > \eta_{t, x}^n = 0 \right] = 1 \quad (51)$$

for $x \in T$, where $\mathbf{Q}_n$ is defined as in Section 2.2. In Section 2.2, we deduced that equation (35) follows from (49) and (50); in exactly the same way it can be shown that equation (51) follows from

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tau - \tau_n) f(n) = \infty \quad (52)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\tau - \tau_n) \lambda(n) f(n) r^{cf(n) \log n} = 0. \quad (53)$$

Now (53) is an immediate consequence of (50). It thus remains to prove (52).

To this end we first rewrite $\tau - \tau_n$ as

$$\tau - \tau_n = \log \left(\frac{r - m(\tau) \sqrt[n]{f(n)/g(n)}}{r - m(\tau)} \right) = \log \left(1 + \frac{m(\tau)}{r - m(\tau)} \left(1 - \sqrt[n]{\frac{f(n)}{g(n)}} \right) \right).$$

Since $\sqrt[n]{f(n)} \rightarrow 1$ and $\sqrt[n]{g(n)} \rightarrow 1$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (the first limit follows from (30), the second limit holds by assumption), we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \sqrt[n]{\frac{f(n)}{g(n)}} \right)^{-1} (\tau - \tau_n) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} y^{-1} \log \left(1 + \frac{m(\tau)}{r - m(\tau)} y \right) = \frac{m(\tau)}{r - m(\tau)} > 0$$

holds. For n large enough, we also have $\frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \leq \frac{n^\gamma}{\exp(n^\alpha)} \leq \frac{1}{\exp(n^\beta)}$ and hence

$$f(n) \left(1 - \sqrt[n]{\frac{f(n)}{g(n)}} \right) \geq n^\gamma \left(1 - \exp(-n^{\beta-1}) \right).$$

Moreover, the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ of the last term is given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^\gamma \left(1 - \exp(-n^{\beta-1}) \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{\gamma+\beta-1} \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-(\beta-1)} \left(1 - \exp(-n^{\beta-1}) \right) = \infty.$$

This yields the proof of (52).

4 Proof of Proposition 1

Let $\tau \in (t_c, \infty)$, let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $(\rho_{t,z}, G_{t,z})_{0 \leq t \leq \tau + \epsilon, z \in T}$ be a self-destructive percolation process on T with parameters τ and ϵ under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}$. So far we have parametrized self-destructive percolation in terms of the length of the time intervals $[0, \tau)$ and $[\tau, \tau + \epsilon]$. For the proof of Proposition 1, however, it will be more convenient to parametrize the final configuration $\rho_{\tau + \epsilon} := (\rho_{\tau + \epsilon, z})_{z \in T}$ in terms of the Bernoulli probabilities $p := 1 - e^{-\tau}$ and $\delta := 1 - e^{-\epsilon}$ for growth at a fixed vertex in the time intervals $[0, \tau)$ and $[\tau, \tau + \epsilon]$, respectively. We therefore use the following alternative notation (which follows along the lines of [vdBB04]):

Let $X_v, v \in T$, and $Y_v, v \in T$, be independent $\{0, 1\}$ -valued random variables under some probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [X_v = 1] &= p, & \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [X_v = 0] &= 1 - p, \\ \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [Y_v = 1] &= \delta, & \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [Y_v = 0] &= 1 - \delta \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in T$. Let $X := (X_v)_{v \in T}$, $Y := (Y_v)_{v \in T}$ and define $X^* = (X_v^*)_{v \in T}$, $Z = (Z_v)_{v \in T}$ by

$$X_v^* := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_v = 1 \text{ and the cluster of } v \text{ in } X \text{ is finite,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$Z_v := X_v^* \vee Y_v.$$

Then the distribution of the final configuration $\rho_{\tau + \epsilon}$ under $\mathbf{P}$ and the distribution of Z under $\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}$ are clearly identical.

Let

$$\theta(p) := \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } X \text{ is infinite}]$$

be the probability that the root $\emptyset$ is in an infinite cluster after the first step of self-destructive percolation (i.e. in independent site percolation on T with parameter p), and let

$$\theta(p, \delta) := \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } Z \text{ is infinite}]$$

be the probability that the root $\emptyset$ is in an infinite cluster in the final configuration of self-destructive percolation. Using the fact that the final configuration Z is positively associated ([vdBB04], Sections 2.2 and 2.3), it is easy to see that the equivalence

$$\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [Z \text{ contains an infinite cluster}] = 0 \Leftrightarrow \theta(p, \delta) = 0$$

holds. For the proof of Proposition 1 it therefore suffices to prove the following proposition, where $p_c := \frac{1}{r} = 1 - e^{-t_c}$ denotes the critical probability of independent site percolation on T :

Proposition 3. *For all $p \in (p_c, 1)$ there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\theta(p, \delta) = 0$.*

Proposition 3 is a generalization of a result by J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer ([vdBB04], Theorem 5.1), who proved the following statement for the case where T is the binary tree (i.e. $r = 2$): If $p \in (p_c, 1)$ and $\delta > 0$ satisfies

$$p(1 - \delta) \geq p_c, \tag{54}$$

then $\theta(p, \delta) = 0$. Our proof of Proposition 3 for general r is based on the same principal ideas as [vdBB04] but eventually takes a different route due to the occurrence of higher order terms for $r \geq 3$. Although these terms turn out to be asymptotically negligible, they are the reason why for $r \geq 3$ we do not obtain an explicit condition on δ like (54).

We first prove a weaker version of Proposition 3:




Figure 1: Illustration of the case $r = 3$ - the 3-regular rooted tree T with the root $\emptyset$, its children 1, 2, 3 and the 3-regular rooted subtrees $T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}, T^{(3)}$

Lemma 6. *For all $p \in (p_c, 1)$ we have $\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \theta(p, \delta) = 0$.*

Proof of Lemma 6. Let $p \in (p_c, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. By distinguishing whether or not the root $\emptyset$ is in an infinite cluster after the first step of self-destructive percolation we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(p, \delta) &\leq \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } X \text{ is infinite, } Y_\emptyset = 1] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta} [\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } X \text{ is finite, the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } X \vee Y \text{ is infinite}] \\ &= \theta(p)\delta + (\theta(p + (1 - p)\delta) - \theta(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta(\cdot)$ is continuous, the last expression tends to zero for $\delta \downarrow 0$, which proves the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3. Suppose that Proposition 3 is not true. Then there exists $p_0 \in (p_c, 1)$ such that for all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ we have $\theta(p_0, \delta) > 0$. In fact, even the stronger statement

$$\forall p \in (p_c, p_0] \forall \delta \in (0, 1) : \theta(p, \delta) > 0 \tag{55}$$

is true. This is due to the fact that if $p_1, p_2 \in (p_c, 1)$ and $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $p_1 \geq p_2$ and $p_1 + (1 - p_1)\delta_1 = p_2 + (1 - p_2)\delta_2$, then $\theta(p_1, \delta_1) \leq \theta(p_2, \delta_2)$ holds (see [vdBB04], Lemma 2.3). We will show that (55) leads to a contradiction.

Let $p \in (p_c, p_0]$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and define the probability measure $\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}$ and the random configurations X, Y, X^*, Z as above (at the beginning of Section 4). We will derive an inequality for $\theta(p, \delta)$ by exploiting the recursive structure of the tree T . So let us denote the r children of the root $\emptyset$ by $1, \dots, r$. For $i = 1, \dots, r$, let $T^{(i)}$ be the r -regular rooted subtree of T which has i as its root (see Figure 1 for an illustration of the case $r = 3$). As before, we will use the term $T^{(i)}$ both for the graph and its vertex set. Let $X^{(i)} := (X_v)_{v \in T^{(i)}}$ and $Y^{(i)} := (Y_v)_{v \in T^{(i)}}$ be the configurations we obtain when we restrict X and Y to the subtree $T^{(i)}$. Moreover, let $X^{*(i)} = (X_v^{*(i)})_{v \in T^{(i)}}$ and $Z^{(i)} = (Z_v^{(i)})_{v \in T^{(i)}}$ be the corresponding configurations for self-destructive percolation on $T^{(i)}$, i.e.

$$X_v^{*(i)} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_v = 1 \text{ and the cluster of } v \text{ in } X^{(i)} \text{ is finite,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$Z_v^{(i)} := X_v^{*(i)} \vee Y_v.$$

Then the quadruples of configurations $(X^{(i)}, Y^{(i)}, X^{*(i)}, Z^{(i)})$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are independent and have the same distribution as (X, Y, X^*, Z) .

Now consider the events

$$A := \left\{ X_\emptyset \vee Y_\emptyset = 1, \exists i \in \{1, \dots, r\} : \text{the cluster of } i \text{ in } Z^{(i)} \text{ is infinite} \right\}$$

and

$$B := \left\{ X_\emptyset = 1, Y_\emptyset = 0, \exists i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\} : i \neq j, \text{the cluster of } i \text{ in } Z^{(i)} \text{ is infinite,} \right. \\ \left. \text{the cluster of } j \text{ in } X^{(j)} \text{ is infinite} \right\}.$$

Since these events satisfy the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } Z \text{ is infinite}\} &\subset A, \\ \{\text{the cluster of } \emptyset \text{ in } Z \text{ is finite}\} &\supset B, \\ B &\subset A, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\theta(p, \delta) \leq \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[A] - \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[B]. \quad (56)$$

From the definition of A we readily deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[A] &= (p + (1 - p)\delta) (1 - (1 - \theta(p, \delta))^r) \\ &= (p + (1 - p)\delta) \cdot r\theta(p, \delta) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p, \delta)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

for $\delta \downarrow 0$, uniformly for $p \in (p_c, p_0]$.

In order to calculate $\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[B]$, we define

$$D_i := \left\{ \text{the cluster of } i \text{ in } Z^{(i)} \text{ is infinite, } \exists j \in \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i\} : \text{the cluster of } j \text{ in } X^{(j)} \text{ is infinite} \right\}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and rewrite B as

$$B = \{X_\emptyset = 1, Y_\emptyset = 0\} \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^r D_i. \quad (58)$$

For $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ the definition of D_i implies

$$\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[D_i] = \theta(p, \delta) \left(1 - (1 - \theta(p))^{r-1} \right),$$

and for $k \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r$ we have the upper bound

$$\mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[D_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap D_{i_k}] \leq \theta(p, \delta)^k.$$

Hence equation (58) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[B] &= p(1 - \delta) \left(\sum_{i=1}^r \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[D_i] + \sum_{k=2}^r \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r} (-1)^{k+1} \mathbf{P}_{p, \delta}[D_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap D_{i_k}] \right) \\ &= p(1 - \delta) \cdot r\theta(p, \delta) \left(1 - (1 - \theta(p))^{r-1} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p, \delta)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

for $\delta \downarrow 0$, uniformly for $p \in (p_c, p_0]$.

Inserting (57) and (59) into the inequality (56) and dividing both sides by $\theta(p, \delta)$ (which is possible because of our assumption (55)), we obtain

$$1 \leq (p + (1 - p)\delta) \cdot r - p(1 - \delta) \cdot r \left(1 - (1 - \theta(p))^{r-1}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p, \delta))$$

for $\delta \downarrow 0$, uniformly for $p \in (p_c, p_0]$.

Finally, letting δ tend to zero and using Lemma 6, we get

$$1 \leq pr(1 - \theta(p))^{r-1}.$$

In the remainder of the proof we show that this inequality leads to a contradiction when p tends to p_c . Expanding the right side of the inequality in powers of $\theta(p)$, we obtain

$$1 \leq pr(1 - (r - 1)\theta(p)) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p)^2) \quad \text{for } p \downarrow p_c. \quad (60)$$

On the other hand, the recursive structure of the tree T implies

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(p) &= p(1 - (1 - \theta(p))^r) \\ &= p \left(r\theta(p) - \frac{1}{2}r(r - 1)\theta(p)^2 \right) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p)^3) \quad \text{for } p \downarrow p_c. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\theta(p)$ (which is positive for $p \in (p_c, p_0]$) gives

$$1 = pr \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}(r - 1)\theta(p) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p)^2) \quad \text{for } p \downarrow p_c. \quad (61)$$

Subtracting (61) from (60) and dividing by $\theta(p)$ again then leads to the inequality

$$0 \leq -\frac{1}{2}pr(r - 1) + \mathcal{O}(\theta(p)) \quad \text{for } p \downarrow p_c.$$

But since $\theta(p) \rightarrow 0$ for $p \downarrow p_c$, this produces a contradiction. $\square$

Acknowledgement. I am grateful to Franz Merkl for helpful discussions and remarks. This work was supported by a scholarship from the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes.

References

- [ADCKS13] D. Ahlberg, H. Duminil-Copin, G. Kozma, and V. Sidoravicius. Seven-dimensional forest fires. *arXiv:1302.6872*, 2013.
- [AST13] D. Ahlberg, V. Sidoravicius, and J. Tykesson. Bernoulli and self-destructive percolation on non-amenable graphs. *arXiv:1302.6870*, 2013.
- [Bak96] P. Bak. *How nature works: the science of self-organized criticality*. Copernicus Series. Springer, 1996.
- [DS92] B. Drossel and F. Schwabl. Self-organized critical forest-fire model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:1629–1632, 1992.
- [Dür06a] M. Dürre. Existence of multi-dimensional infinite volume self-organized critical forest-fire models. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 11:513–539, 2006.

- [Dür06b] M. Dürre. Uniqueness of multi-dimensional infinite volume self-organized critical forest-fire models. *Electron. Commun. Probability*, 11:304–315, 2006.
- [Dür09] M. Dürre. *Self-organized critical phenomena: forest fire and sandpile models*. PhD thesis, LMU München, 2009.
- [Har63] T. E. Harris. *The theory of branching processes*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer, 1963.
- [Jen98] H. Jensen. *Self-organized criticality: emergent complex behavior in physical and biological systems*. Cambridge lecture notes in physics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [KMS13] D. Kiss, I. Manolescu, and V. Sidoravicius. Planar lattices do not recover from forest fires. *arXiv:1312.7004*, 2013.
- [KS66] H. Kesten and B. P. Stigum. A limit theorem for multidimensional Galton-Watson processes. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 37(5):1211–1223, 1966.
- [Lig85] T. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer, 1985.
- [RT09] B. Ráth and B. Tóth. Erdős-Rényi random graphs + forest fires = self-organized criticality. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 14:1290–1327, 2009.
- [vdBB04] J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer. Self-destructive percolation. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 24:480–501, 2004.
- [vdBB06] J. van den Berg and R. Brouwer. Self-organized forest-fires near the critical time. *Commun. Math. Physics*, 267:265–277, 2006.
- [vdBBV08] J. van den Berg, R. Brouwer, and B. Vágvolgyi. Box-crossings and continuity results for self-destructive percolation in the plane. In *In and Out of Equilibrium 2*, volume 60 of *Progress in Probability*, pages 117–135. Birkhäuser Basel, 2008.
- [vdBdL09] J. van den Berg and B. N. B. de Lima. Linear lower bounds for $\delta_c(p)$ for a class of 2d self-destructive percolation models. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 34(4):520–526, 2009.